

### REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed April 17, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. No claims have been added, amended or canceled herein. No new matter has been added.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

As a preliminary matter, Applicants note with appreciation the indication of allowance of claims 16-20.

#### Claims Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3, 7 and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as purportedly being anticipated by Ojha et al. (Reduced Size RF Coupler Design for Specialized Load Requirements). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. Applicants respectfully point out that the Office Action's reliance on the doctrine of inherency is improper. However, the doctrine of inherency will not be discussed further herein because the claims clearly distinguish over Ojha et al. Applicants reserve the right to raise this issue at a later time.

The Office Action states that the top conductive line in FIG. 2 of Ojha, having ports 2 and 3, purportedly shows the "first conductive line" of Applicants' claims 1 and 8, and that the bottom conductive line, having port 1 and a grounded port, purportedly shows the "second conductive line" of Applicants' claims 1 and 8. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Ojha et al. illustrates (Fig. 2) an RF coupler having a first capacitor coupled to two ends (ports 2 and 3, top of FIG. 2) of a first conductive line and a second capacitor coupled to two ends (port 1 and ground, bottom of FIG. 2) of a second conductive line. The bottom conductive line of Ojha has only two ports: port 1 and a grounded port. Therefore, the bottom conductive line of Ojha has only one port (port 1) that can provide a signal, as the other port is grounded.

By contrast, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a directional distributed coupler comprising ... a second conductive line ... the second conductive line comprising a first terminal and a second terminal ... the second conductive line being coupled to the first conductive line such that the first terminal provides a first signal ... and the second terminal provides a second signal. **Ojha does not teach or suggest that the bottom conductive line in FIG. 2 of Ojha has a second terminal [that] provides a second signal.** Rather, as discussed above, the bottom conductive

line in FIG. 2 of Ojha has only one **one port (port 1) that can provide a signal because the other port is grounded**. Therefore, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Ojha. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 8 as recites, *inter alia*, a distributed coupler... the second conductive line comprising a third terminal and a fourth terminal, the second conductive line being coupled to the first conductive line such that the third terminal provides a first coupled signal ... and a fourth terminal provides a second coupled signal. **Ojha does not teach or suggest that the bottom conductive line in FIG. 2 of Ojha has a third terminal [that] provides a first coupled signal and a fourth terminal [that] provides a second coupled signal**. Rather, as discussed above, the bottom conductive line in FIG. 2 of Ojha has only one **one port (port 1) that can provide a signal because the other port is grounded**. Therefore, claim 8 patentably distinguishes over Ojha. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-15 and 20 depend from claim 8 and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above remarks, Applicants the pending application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Dated: August 17, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

James H. Morris  
Registration No.: 34,681  
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.  
Federal Reserve Plaza  
600 Atlantic Avenue  
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206  
(617) 646-8000